

REMARKS

Claims 20-23, 31-33, 53-56, and 64-66 are pending in the application. The Office rejected claims 20 (apparently inadvertently identified as "claim 1" in the Office Action), 21, 32, 33, 53, 54, 64, 65, and 66 as indefinite. In addition, the Office objected to claims 20 (apparently inadvertently identified as "claim 1" in the Office Action), 22-23, 31-33, 53-56, and 64-66 as including informalities. The Office Action indicated that all of the pending claims would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections and objections.

With this paper, the Applicant amends claims 20, 22, 31, 32, 33, 53, 54, 55, 64, 65, and 66, as specified above. The Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments overcome the rejections and objections to the claims, and place the claims in allowable condition. In addition, the Applicant makes the following remarks.

At pages 2 and 3, the Office Action refers to "claim 1." From the context and, given that claim 1 is not pending in the application, the Applicant assumes that the Office Action meant to refer to claim 20. Accordingly, the Applicant amends claim 20 with this paper. With respect to claim 54, the Office Action states that in "line 3, 'is' should be 'are.'" Office Action at 3. The Applicant respectfully points out that line 3 of claim 53 does not include the word "is." The Applicant assumes that the Examiner sought to change "are" to "is" in claim 53, and amends the claim accordingly.

With respect to claims 20, 21, 53, and 54, the Office Action states that "'first state' is vague and indefinite since no second state is recited in other claim(s)." The Applicant respectfully disagrees, and points out that a person of ordinary skill in the art reading the specification as a whole would understand the meaning of the claimed language. With respect to claims 32 and 65, the Office Action states that "it is unclear what is meant" by "'provide as the data signal each of the output signals of the analog-to-digital converter circuitry on alternating transitions of the transfer clock.'" Furthermore, the Office Action states with respect to claims 33 and 66 that "it is unclear what is meant" by "... as a signal in the plurality of control signals." The Office Action does not elaborate why the Examiner considers the language of the claims vague or unclear.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejections, and submits that the claims are not indefinite. The Applicant further notes that, without sufficient elaboration of the alleged lack of clarity, it cannot discern the exact nature of any deficiency. Solely to facilitate compact prosecution and to expedite the issuance of a patent, however, the Applicant has made a good-faith effort to amend the claims to overcome the rejections. The Applicant does not make the amendments because of any cited references or for reasons of patentability, and reserves the right to pursue the rejected and/or other claims in follow-on and/or other applications and to present arguments with respect to such claims in such applications.

In view of the above remarks, the Applicant respectfully submits that the presently pending claims are allowable. The Applicant therefore respectfully requests a prompt Notice of Allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in allowable condition. Consequently, favorable reconsideration and prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

The examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the phone number indicated below with any questions or comments, or to otherwise facilitate expeditious and compact prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,



MAXIMILIAN R. PETERSON
Registration No. 46,469
Attorney for Applicant

LAW OFFICES OF MAXIMILIAN R. PETERSON
P.O. Box 93005
Austin, Texas 78709-3005
Phone: 512-382-4404
Fax: 512-382-4405